arXiv:math/0702486v1 [math.QA] 16 Feb 2007

Krein duality, positive 2-algebras, and dilation of comultiplications

A. M. Vershik*

16.02.07

To the centenary of Mark Krein

Abstract

The Krein–Tannaka duality for compact groups was a generalization the Pontryagin–Van Kampen duality for locally compact abelian groups and a remote predecessor of the theory of tensor categories. It is less known that it found applications in algebraic combinatorics ("Krein algebras"). Later, this duality was substantially extended: in [29], the notion of *involutive algebras in positive vector duality* was introduced. In this paper, we reformulate the notions of this theory using the language of bialgebras (and Hopf algebras) and introduce the class of involutive bialgebras and positive 2-algebras. The main goal of the paper is to give a precise statement of a new problem, which we consider as one of the main problems in this field, concerning the existence of dilations (embeddings) of positive 2-algebras into involutive bialgebras, or, in other words, the problem of describing subobjects in involutive bialgebras. We define two types of subobjects in the category of bialgebras, strict and nonstrict ones, and consider the corresponding embeddings (dilations) of positive 2-algebras into bialgebras. The difference between the two types of dilations is illustrated by the example of bicommutative positive 2-algebras (commutative hypergroups). The most interesting instance of our problem concerns dilations of the Hecke algebra $H_n(q)$. It seems that in this case strict dilations may exist only for $q = p^k$ (with p a prime); it is not known whether nonstrict dilations exist for other q. We also show that the class of finite-dimensional involutive semisimple bialgebras coincides with the class of semigroup algebras of finite inverse semigroups.

*St. Petersburg Department of Steklov Institute of Mathematics. E-mail: vershik@pdmi.ras.ru. Partially supported by the RFBR grant 05-01-00899 and CRDF grant RUM1-2622-ST-04.

1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to formulate the problem of lifting an involutive algebra with positive multiplication and comultiplication (we call such an object a positive 2-algebra) into an involutive bialgebra, for example, into the group bialgebra of a finite group or an inverse semigroup. This problem arose in connection with some problems of the theory of association schemes, and also in connection with some combinatorial problems of representation theory. But the dilation problem itself is akin to some questions of operator theory (dilations of semigroups of operators) and the theory of dynamical and algebraic systems. In short, we call it the problem of dilating comultiplications or derandomizing a random multiplication.

Many ideas in this field spring from M. G. Krein's works on duality and positivity; that is why we begin (Sec. 2) with a brief historical survey on positive multiplications and duality, which shows the complicated way in which M. G. Krein's ideas on duality and positivity of algebras have finally united nowadays. This survey is not complete and does not touch upon many close questions (see [27]).

The most impressive concrete instance of our main problem is given in Sec. 3; it concerns the Hecke algebra $H_n(q)$ and its embedding into $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$. We consider this problem from different points of view.

In Sec. 4 we define the category of *positive involutive 2-algebras*, i.e., spaces with positive (with respect to the given involution and coinvolution) multiplication and comultiplication, which will be called positive 2-algebras. The category of such 2-algebras includes the category of bialgebras [11] and Hopf algebras: in this case, the multiplication and the comultiplication are not homomorphisms, but only positive maps. Functorially, it is equivalent to the category of $*$-*algebras in positive duality* introduced by the author [29] in 1971, but in this paper we use the language of bialgebras and multiplications-comultiplications instead of the language of algebras in duality. Let us emphasize that the idea of duality itself is in a sense a continuation of M. G. Krein's ideas. The problem of lifting positive operations to multiplicative ones is traditional for functional analysis and its applications (see [25]). Here we formulate it in a purely algebraic context. In Sec. 5 we define two kinds of subobjects in involutive bialgebras, and then (Sec. 6) give a precise statement of the general problem, defining what it means to embed a positive 2-algebra into a bialgebra. For want of space, we omit examples and calculations for some (bicommutative) cases, see [32]. The general dilation problem is far from being solved.

2 M. G. Krein's work on duality and positivity in algebras

In the 40s, M. G. Krein worked in representation theory and published several papers on this subject. The papers [17, 18] are devoted to invariant Hermitian-positive kernels on homogeneous spaces and are close to his favourite circle of problems concerning positive definiteness and its relations to operator theory.[1] As far as I know, he did not continue the work started in these papers; nevertheless, they became rather widely known. In particular, in what follows we will need one of the results from [18], a theorem on the equivalence of algebraic and scalar positivity. In the pre-war paper [15] and the more complete paper [16] on the same subject, which seem to be in no way connected to the previous ones (though the paper [16] cites the main result of [18]), the Pontryagin–Van Kampen duality for locally compact abelian groups, very popular at that time, was extended to compact nonabelian groups (somewhat earlier this had been done, though in less generality, by T. Tannaka; M.G. learned about this from D. A. Raikov after the paper [16] had been published).

While in the abelian case, the duality does not lead out of the category of abelian groups: the "Fourier functor" associates with a given group the group of its characters and generalizes the classical Fourier transform theory from $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ to all locally compact abelian groups, in the nonabelian case, the dual object is no longer a group, but an algebra. What is now called a Krein block algebra [17] is a commutative algebra partitioned into an at most countable sum of simple finite-dimensional algebras over $\mathbb{C}$ with a distinguished basis. This basis is the basis of matrix units in all classes of equivalent irreducible representations of the group. More precisely, if G is a compact group, then one can easily see that its Krein-dual block algebra is the algebra of all continuous functions on G endowed with a decomposition into the direct sum of minimal two-sided ideals and a *basis* consisting of the matrix elements of all unitary irreducible representations. The Krein duality theorem says that this block algebra determines the group up to an isomorphism: it is the group of scalar homomorphisms that are multiplicative on the basis. The proof exploits, in a spectacular way, Gelfand's theory of normed rings.[2] M.G. realizes the group algebra of a compact group as, in his words, a block algebra, i.e., an algebra of functions on the countable set of classes of irreducible unitary representations with matrix values; choosing an appropriate basis in this algebra, we arrive at the duality theorem.

A more symmetric statement of Krein's theorems arises if we get rid of bases and use the

[1] "I respond to the words 'a positive definite function' like a war-horse to a trumpet call," M.G. said, in the elevated style typical for him, in his talk at a conference on functional analysis held in Odessa in 1958.

[2] I dare to conjecture that it is the success of the recently appeared Gelfand's theory of normed rings, and especially the theory of infinite-dimensional representations, that stimulated M. G. Krein and A. N. Kolmogorov to work on these problems (see their correspondence in [14]).

invariant language of the theory of duality of algebras as vector spaces, see Sec. 5. The first algebra is the group algebra of the group G over some field; and the dual algebra is the algebra of continuous functions on the group with values in the same field. Such a formulation, in the spirit of Bourbaki's duality theory for vector spaces [3], was suggested by the author in [29], where he introduced the notion of pairs of $*$-algebras in duality and its geometric analog, the theory of packets. This theory was elaborated in [12, 13] by S. V. Kerov and, more recently, in [31, 5, 8].

The modern formulation of such a duality, developed gradually starting from the papers of that time, uses the terminology of bialgebras and Hopf algebras. It is as follows: in the group algebra there is a commutative comultiplication, in the commutative algebra of functions on the group there is a convolution comultiplication, and each of these two bialgebras determines the other one. This formulation, without any modifications, works for finite groups; later it was generalized to universal enveloping algebras of Lie groups. But in the general case of locally compact groups, it requires serious topological comments, and M.G.'s paper in fact provided those considerations from the theory of normed rings that suffice for compact groups. In continuation of the works of Tannaka and Krein, duality for general locally compact groups was considered by many other authors. The theory of duality of group algebras and algebras of functions on groups eventually resulted, though not only for internal reasons, in the theory of quantum groups. Besides, these works provided a basis for a number of direct generalizations: Tannaka–Krein categories in algebraic geometry [7, 22], Tannaka-Krein duality for groupoids, the notion of monoidal categories (see [19, 28, 9]), the theory of hypergroups and multivalued groups, the theory of generalized shift, noncommutative integration (I. Segal, W. F. Stinespring, G. I. Kac, and others). All these topics are considered in several hundred papers and several dozen books.

However, it should be noted that duality for noncommutative groups, when it is formulated in abstract form and does not involve some special properties of the group, is tautological; moreover, I dare say that it had no serious analytic consequences comparable to the Fourier theory for abelian groups. The cause is that the category dual to the category of group algebras is difficult to describe independently in invariant terms, even in the finite-dimensional case. In order to construct an interesting generalization of Fourier theory and harmonic analysis, one needs an additional structure on the group or the algebra under consideration, which fixes a certain commutative subgroup (subalgebra) defined in invariant terms, for example, the Cartan subgroup (in the theory of semisimple Lie algebras), the Gelfand–Tsetlin algebra (in the theory of symmetric and similar groups), etc. Then the duality becomes an analytic tool for studying groups or algebras.

At the same time, the true development of Krein's ideas on duality took quite another course, in which these ideas were combined with the positivity theorems from [17, 18].

Namely, a real application, which apparently was not quite foreseen by the authors,[3] was discovered much later, on the one hand, in the theory of duality of algebras (see above), and on the other hand, with significant delay, in algebraic combinatorics and the theory of association schemes (see, e.g., [1]). It is in this field that the notion of a block (Krein) algebra became a model for generalizations and started to be used not only for group algebras. In modern terms, this was the transition from bialgebras and Hopf algebras to systems (2-algebras) with a *less rigid agreement between multiplications and comultiplications*. And the crucial argument for constructing this theory was precisely one of the positivity theorems from [18] rather than duality itself.

In short, the intricate chain of references to these papers by M. G. Krein looks as follows. The positivity condition for a very special case was introduced by D. Higman in 1964. Then L. Scott published a brief note in *Notices* [23] saying that his colleague C. Dunkl, a specialist in harmonic analysis, drew his attention to the fact that Krein's paper [17] contains a general positivity condition for homogeneous spaces, so that Higman's condition, as Scott joked, is new only for the example considered by Higman. This was followed by papers of D. Higman [10], L. Scott [24], and many others on the algebraic theory of association schemes (see [1]), after which the condition of positivity of the Krein constants became generally accepted and widely used. It is interesting that all these papers, as well as subsequent papers on this subject, are strongly influenced by the paper [16] on block algebras, and it is the notion of a block algebra that they generalize to a nongroup situation (which was not considered by M.G.), but in fact they use not so much the results of [16] on constructing the block algebra of a compact group, as the simple positivity condition for functions on homogeneous spaces, which plays a crucial role in all these considerations, from the paper [18]. Note that the preliminary paper [15] published in 1941 was noticed by S. Bochner [2] already during the war; apparently, that is the reason why this result of M.G. became known in the West rather early, at least to specialists in functional analysis. It is also interesting that these papers by M. G. Krein were rediscovered and exploited in the studies on algebraic combinatorics, with almost 30 years delay, by mathematicians working in the United States and Japan rather than Ukraine or Moscow, where there were many specialists working on exactly the same problems and where M. G. Krein's works must have been more known. However, when preparing the above-mentioned paper [29], in which the so-called positive duality of $*$-algebras was introduced and the positivity of multiplication and comultiplication was postulated, I also was guided rather by the duality theorems of Krein and Tannaka and

[3] In 1980, M.G. showed me a book on algebraic coding theory and relation schemes sent him by the author (as far as I remember, P. Delsarte), where his name appeared on every two pages, and said with some embarrassment, "I have nothing to do with this and do not understand this at all." "This" was precisely the Krein duality, but not for the group algebras of compact groups, as in his papers, but for algebras generated by association schemes.

their followers than by M.G.'s papers [17, 18, 16], which I already knew. The paper [29] on positive pairings of $*$-algebras was conceived as an attempt to extend the Krein duality from groups to homogeneous spaces of double cosets, but then it turned out that the suggested weakening of the multiplicativity condition covers much more general objects, not necessarily of group origin. But in this paper, we relate the main topic to another field, in which M.G. also worked, namely, to the theory of dilations. This link is apparently new. In functional analysis, the theory of dilations is represented by works of Foias and Nagy, Krein's school, W. F. Stinespring (the theorem on dilation of completely positive maps), M. A. Naimark (lifting of positive operator measures to projection measures or spectral measures), etc.; now it appears also in problems of purely algebraic nature.

3 An instance of the main problem

3.1 Dilation of the classical Hecke algebra

The complex Hecke algebra $H_n(q)$, $q \in (0,\infty)$, $n \geq 2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is the algebra with generators τ_i, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, satisfying the relations

$$\tau_i \tau_j = \tau_i \tau_j, \qquad |i-j| > 1,\ i,j = 1,\dots,n-1,$$

$$(\tau_i + 1)(\tau_i - q) = 0, \qquad i = 1,\dots,n-1,$$

$$\tau_i \tau_{i+1} \tau_i = \tau_{i+1} \tau_i \tau_{i+1}, \qquad i = 1,\dots,n-2.$$

It is well known that this algebra is isomorphic to the group algebra $\mathbb{C}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$, and the elements τ_i, $i = 1,\dots,n-1$, are deformations of the classical Coxeter transpositions σ_i. A linear basis of the Hecke algebra is indexed by the elements of the symmetric group: $\mathfrak{S}_n \ni g \to \tau_g$, where the Coxeter transposition $\sigma_i = (i, i+1) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is associated to the generator $\tau_{\sigma_i} \equiv \tau_i$, $i = 1,\dots,n-1$, and an arbitrary permutation g with *reduced* decomposition into a product of Coxeter transpositions $g = \prod_k \sigma_{i_k}$ is associated to the element $\tau_g = \prod_k \tau_{i_k}$. Consider the coordinatewise cocommutative comultiplication in this algebra, which is diagonal in the above basis $\{\tau_g\}$:

$$\Delta(\tau_g) = \tau_g \bigotimes \tau_g, \qquad g \in \mathfrak{S}_n.$$

For $q \neq 1$, the linear basis $\{\tau_g\}$, $g \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, does not form a group (the product of two elements of this basis, $\tau_{h_1} \cdot \tau_{h_2} = \sum_g c^g_{h_1,h_2} \tau_s$, is only a linear combination of basis elements), so that *this comultiplication is no longer a homomorphism of the algebra* $H_n(q)$ to the algebra $H_n(q) \bigotimes H_n(q)$. Hence the Hecke algebra is not a bialgebra, and *a fortiori* not a Hopf algebra, which is the case for the group algebras $\mathbb{C}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$. At the same time, if $q = p^m$ is a power of

a prime number p, then a classical result says that the Hecke algebra $H_n(q)$ is a subalgebra of the group bialgebra $\mathbb{C}(GL_n(F_q))$ of the group $GL_n(F_q)$ of all invertible matrices over the finite field F_q, namely, the subalgebra of double cosets of a Borel subgroup (the group of upper triangular matrices); in this case, the comultiplication in $H_n(q)$ introduced above is a projection of the comultiplication in the group algebra. Thus the Hecke algebra $H_n(q)$ for $q = p^m$ can be embedded into the group algebra of the group $GL_n(F_q)$.

However, for $q > 1$ *the comultiplication in the Hecke algebra, being no longer a homomorphism, still remains a positive map* in the sense of the cone of positive elements (with respect to the natural involution); indeed, as can easily be seen, the coefficients $c^s_{g,h}$, the structure constants of the multiplication, are nonnegative. It is obvious that the positivity of the comultiplication and multiplication is a necessary condition for the embeddability into a bialgebra, since homomorphisms are always positive maps and the positivity is preserved under positive projections (but, of course, not every positive map is multiplicative). Using the language of operator theory, we may say that for $q = p^m$ there exists a *dilation* (lifting) of the Hecke algebra: the original positive but not multiplicative operations, the multiplication and comultiplication in $H_n(q)$, in the ambient group bialgebra $\mathbb{C}(GL_n(F_q))$ are restrictions and projections of multiplicative operations.[4]

Thus a natural question arises, whether the positivity of the multiplication and comultiplication is a sufficient condition for the embeddability into some bialgebra. More precisely,

whether a similar embedding also exists for other values $q \neq p^m$, i.e., whether the Hecke algebra $H_n(q)$ for other values of q can be embedded, with the same multiplication and a dilation of the comultiplication, into some bialgebra, not necessarily a group one, or into a Hopf algebra, even perhaps infinite-dimensional? Indeed, the necessary condition for the existence of such an embedding, the positivity of the multiplication and comultiplication, is satisfied.

To state the problem, we need to specify what the term "embedding" or "dilation" means; to this end, we define two notions of a subobject in a bialgebra. The preliminary analysis of these notions and a partial solution of the problem for two-dimensional positive 2-algebras

[4]Examples of using the term "dilation" are as follows: a unitary dilation of a contraction T in a Hilbert space K is a unitary operator U in an extension $H \supset K$ such that for the orthogonal projection $P : H \to K$ and all positive integers n, the equality $T^n = PU^n$ holds (Naimark-type or Nagy-type theorems, etc.); or another situation, which is closer to the one under consideration: a dilation of a positive (Markov) operator T in L^2 is a unitary multiplicative operator U with a similar property: $T^n = PU^n$ for some expectation P (see [30]). In our case, we consider only a dilation of the comultiplication, regarded as an operation from the algebra to its tensor square, since the multiplication is directly inherited from the ambient bialgebra. Dilations were also considered by M. G. Krein and Foias and Nagy, see [25]. In contrast to known theorems on dilations of a single operator, we want to find, for example, coherent dilations of the family of operators of multiplication by all the basis elements of the algebra.

is the main subject of this paper.

The existence of a strict (see below) embedding of the Hecke algebra $H_n(q)$ into the *group algebra of a finite group* for general q is unlikely; for instance, for $n = 3$, $q \neq p^m$ embeddings into group bialgebras do not exist (an observation due to I. N. Ponomarenko). On the contrary, it is rather the existence of such a group ($GL_n(q)$) for $q = p^m$ that looks surprising. And though, as we will see, the class of involutive semisimple bialgebras is not exhausted by group bialgebras, and the complete description of this class given here shows that it coincides with the class of semigroup bialgebras of finite inverse semigroups, nevertheless this does not increase the possibilities for the positive answer.

A description of *obstacles for the existence of such embeddings* would be not less interesting for the analysis of such objects. They appear already in dimension 2. An obvious obstacle for the existence of *finite-dimensional* covering algebras is the irrationality of the structure constants of the comultiplication. An obstacle for the existence of *group dilations* is a violation of certain arithmetic relations between the structure constants; alternatively, such an obstacle may be related to conditions on the orders of groups and subgroups, etc. Anyway, the author does not know the general answer concerning the existence of dilations of the Hecke algebras into bialgebras.

3.2 Probabilistic interpretation: derandomization of a random multiplication

Our example with the Hecke algebra can be viewed in another way. Let us make a change of generators:

$$\bar{\tau}_g = q^{-l(g)}\tau_g, \qquad g \in \mathfrak{S}_n,$$

where $l(g)$ is the reduced length of a permutation g; in particular, $\bar{\tau}_i = \frac{\tau_i}{q}$, $\bar{e} = e$. Now consider the formula

$$\bar{\tau}_{h_1} \cdot \bar{\tau}_{h_2} = \sum_g \mu^g_{h_1,h_2}\bar{\tau}_g$$

for the multiplication of elements of the new basis. It is easy to check that in the chosen normalization the sum $\sum_s \mu^g_{h_1,h_2}$ becomes equal to one (and all these coefficients are non-negative), so that we may say that the product of any two elements of the new basis is a probability measure μ_{h_1,h_2} on the set $\{\tau_g,\, g \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$. In other words, the multiplication is "probabilistic," or "random," in contrast to the multiplication in groups or semigroups, which is "deterministic" (in a clear sense).

Given a group or a semigroup, or a more general system with a binary operation, let us say that a partition of this system into subsets (blocks) is *stable* if the vector subspace of all linear combinations of blocks is an algebra. Then the above question concerning

a dilation of the multiplication can be formulated as follows. Assume that we are given a "random" multiplication on the set $\mathfrak{S}_n$ (or on another set); thus the vector space of functions on this set is an algebra. The question is whether the multiplication in this algebra is a projection (randomization) of a deterministic multiplication? In more detail, does there exist a group or a semigroup (or even a G-space) and a stable partition of this system such that for any two blocks of this partition (s and t), the distribution of their product, regarded as a measure on the set of blocks, coincides with the multiplication rule in the original algebra (the measure $\mu_{s,t}$ in the example above)? In this interpretation, our question is *how to derandomize a random multiplication or comultiplication.* Analogous but simpler derandomization problems arise, for instance, in the general theory of Markov processes, ergodic theory, etc. Such a derandomization is suggested at the end of the paper. Another, combinatorial, reformulation of our problem is as follows: is it possible to represent the multiplication and comultiplication tensors of a positive 2-algebra (see below) with rational real coefficients as factors of multiplication and comultiplication tensors with coefficients $(0, 1)$? This aspect of the problem will be considered separately.

4 Bialgebras, involutive bialgebras

4.1 Bialgebras

Definition 1. *A **2-algebra** is a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ in which there is a structure of an associative algebra with unit and that of a coassociative coalgebra with counit over the same field (in general, without any conditions on the compatibility of these structures). **In what follows, unless otherwise stated, we consider only finite-dimensional 2-algebras that are semisimple algebras and coalgebras (a coalgebra is semisimple if its dual algebra is semisimple).** A bialgebra (see* [11]*) is a 2-algebra satisfying the following equivalent conditions:* 1) *the comultiplication and the counit are homomorphisms of the corresponding algebras;* 2) *the multiplication and the unit are homomorphisms of the corresponding coalgebras.*[5]

Denote the multiplication, regarded as an operator from A to $A \bigotimes A$, by δ, the unit by ϵ, the comultiplication by $\Delta : A \to A \bigotimes A$, and the counit by ε. The definition of a bialgebra is symmetric with respect to the pairs (Δ, ε) and (δ, ϵ), which often makes it superfluous to

[5]It would be natural to use the term "bialgebra" for objects that we have called 2-algebras, and use an epithet to express one or another kind of compatibility between the multiplication and the comultiplication; then what is now called a bialgebra should be called a "multiplicative bialgebra," what is now called a "positive 2-algebra" (see below) should be called a "positive bialgebra," etc. But, unfortunately, it is too late for such a change of terminology.

prove parallel assertions. Sometimes we will also write the product in A in the ordinary way: $\delta(x, y) = x \cdot y$.

It is useful to relate all these and subsequent definitions with the definitions of pairs of finite-dimensional algebras in duality. Let A be a 2-algebra. Recall that in the finite-dimensional case the dual space to an algebra (coalgebra) is a coalgebra (respectively, an algebra). Let us define a multiplication in the dual vector space A' as the map adjoint to the comultiplication Δ, an involution in A' as the operation adjoint to the coinvolution in A, and a unit in A' as the counit in A. Then we may speak of the pair of algebras A and A' in duality with some or other additional properties (multiplicativity, positivity, etc.). Conversely, an ordered pair of algebras in a nondegenerate duality generates a 2-algebra. This observation will be used in what follows.

The group algebra of a finite group with convolution multiplication and diagonal comultiplication is obviously a cocommutative bialgebra (and even a Hopf algebra). It is also well known (see [11]) that the semigroup algebra of any finite semigroup (monoid) with unit, equipped with the natural operations, is also a cocommutative bialgebra. In what follows, we will speak of *group* or *semigroup* bialgebras, meaning that they are endowed with both multiplicative structures.

4.2 Involutive bialgebras

Our plan is to introduce an additional structure in bialgebras, which somehow or other exists in group bialgebras and bialgebras close to them, and then to weaken some requirements on the structures of bialgebras. Let us equip a bialgebra A with an involution and a coinvolution; an involution in A is a second-order antilinear antiautomorphism of the algebra A; similarly, a second-order antilinear antiautomorphism of the coalgebra A is called a coinvolution. Hopf algebras with involution (but without coinvolution) were considered earlier; see, e.g., [11]. Denote the involution and the coinvolution in A by $\sharp$ and $\flat$, respectively. In this notation, the relations between the involution, coinvolution, multiplication, and comultiplication look as follows:

$$\delta(\sharp \otimes \sharp) = \sharp\delta J, \qquad (\flat \otimes \flat)\Delta = J\Delta\flat,$$

where J is the permutation (flip) in the tensor product: $J(x \otimes y) = y \otimes x$.

Definition 2. *A bialgebra equipped with an involution and a coinvolution is called an* ***involutive bialgebra*** *or a bialgebra with involution if the multiplication commutes with the coinvolution and the comultiplication commutes with the involution:*

$$\Delta\sharp = (\sharp \otimes \sharp)\Delta, \qquad \delta(\flat \otimes \flat) = \flat\delta.$$

Given an algebra with an involution $\sharp$, we can define the notion of *nonnegative elements*, i.e., elements of the form $x \cdot x^\sharp$. They form a convex *cone* $K^\sharp$, which will be called the *positive cone with respect to the involution* $\sharp$ (in the finite-dimensional case, this cone will be closed). *The positive cone* $K^\flat$ *with respect to the coinvolution* $\flat$ is defined as follows: this is the complete preimage under the comultiplication Δ of the conic hull of the set of elements of the form $x \otimes x^\flat \in A \bigotimes A$, $x \in A$; in other words, $K^\flat = \{y \in A : \Delta y = \sum_i a_i \otimes a_i^\flat\}$.[6]

Theorem 1. *The comultiplication in an involutive bialgebra preserves the positive cone with respect to the involution, and the multiplication preserves the positive cone with respect to the coinvolution; in short, in an involutive bialgebra the multiplication and the comultiplication are* ***positive****.*

Remark. This assertion contains, in particular, the algebraic part of Krein's theorem on positivity of multiplication and comultiplication for the finite-dimensional case.

Proof. We must prove that the coproduct of an element nonnegative with respect to the involution lies in the positive cone, and that the product of elements nonnegative with respect to the coinvolution lies in the corresponding cone. By symmetry, it suffices to prove one of these claims; the second one will follow from the first one by replacing the comultiplication with the multiplication and the involution with the coinvolution, and passing to the dual bialgebra. When proving that the coproduct of positive elements is positive, we may restrict ourselves to considering elements of the form $x \cdot x^\sharp$, $x \in A$, since they generate the cone of positive elements. The following calculations use the commutation relations stated above:

$$\Delta(x \cdot x^\sharp) = \Delta(x)\Delta(x^\sharp) = \Delta(x)[\Delta(x)]^\sharp.$$

We have used the multiplicativity of the comultiplication and the fact that it commutes with the involution; similarly, the proof of the second claim uses the multiplicativity of the multiplication (with respect to the comultiplication) and the fact that it commutes with the coinvolution. □

4.3 Involutive bialgebras and semigroup algebras of inverse semigroups

The complex group algebras of finite groups with the natural structures are involutive bialgebras in the sense defined above: the involution is generated by taking the inverse element in the group ($g \to g^{-1}$), and the coinvolution is generated by taking the conjugates of the

[6] In terms of duality, $K^\flat$ is just the cone dual to the cone of positive elements in the dual algebra with respect to the involution adjoint to $\flat$.

coefficients. Moreover, an involutive cocommutative Hopf algebra is the group bialgebra of a finite group. Below we will consider the class of finite-dimensional involutive semisimple cocommutative bialgebras and relate it to an important class of semigroups.

Namely, we will show that the class of finite inverse unital semigroups generates exactly the class of involutive semisimple bialgebras. Recall (see [6]) that an inverse semigroup is a semigroup S in which every element $a \in S$ has a unique inverse element, i.e., an element $b \in S$ such that $aba = a$. The uniqueness of such an element guarantees that the inverse element to b is a, so that in an inverse semigroup there is a natural involution, which associates with each element a its inverse element denoted by $a^* = a^{-1}$. The multiplication, comultiplication, and coinvolution are defined in the same way as in the group case. If the semigroup S has a two-sided identity element, then the functional "the value at this identity element" is a counit (in the coalgebra).

The main example of an inverse semigroup, which is most interesting for us, is the *symmetric inverse semigroup* $\mathcal{I}_n$ of one-to-one partial maps of an n-element set into itself (i.e., bijections between subsets of this set), with the empty map as the zero of the semigroup. An important theorem, which generalizes Cayley's theorem on groups, says that every finite inverse semigroup has an isomorphic embedding into a symmetric inverse semigroup.

Example. Consider the inverse semigroup $\mathcal{I}_n^1$ consisting of the n^2 matrix units $\{e_{i,j}\}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and the zero 0 with the ordinary matrix multiplication. The inverse element is defined as follows: $e_{i,j}^* = e_{j,i}$, $0^* = 0$. The semigroup algebra $\mathbb{C}(\mathcal{I}_n^1)$ is the direct sum $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \bigoplus \mathbb{C}$ of the algebra of matrices and the one-dimensional two-sided ideal, equipped with the Kronecker comultiplication (i.e., in the dual formulation, the coordinatewise comultiplication). The reduced semigroup bialgebra (i.e., the quotient by the one-dimensional ideal generated by the zero of the semigroup) is simply the matrix bialgebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ (with the Kronecker comultiplication). As was noted above, both algebras are nonunital involutive bialgebras. The semigroup $\mathcal{I}_n^1$ is a subsemigroup of the symmetric inverse semigroup $\mathcal{I}_n$ mentioned above.

Theorem 2. *The semigroup algebra of a finite inverse unital semigroup is a semisimple cocommutative involutive bialgebra. Analogously, the dual semigroup algebra $\mathbb{C}(S)$ of a finite inverse unital semigroup S is a commutative involutive bialgebra. Conversely, every finite-dimensional semisimple cocommutative (in the dual version, commutative) involutive bialgebra is isomorphic (as an involutive bialgebra) to the semigroup algebra (respectively, the dual semigroup algebra) of a finite inverse unital semigroup.*

This statement can be generalized to inverse nonunital semigroups: one should only notice that the semigroup algebra is not exactly a bialgebra, since either it has no counit or the counit does not define a homomorphism into the field.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{C}(S)$ be the semigroup algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ of a finite inverse semigroup S. Oganesyan's theorem [20] says that the semigroup algebra of every finite inverse semigroup is semisimple. Hence we only have to check the conditions related to the involution; namely, that $(ab)^* = b^*a^*$. This is indeed true (see [6, Lemma 1.18]). The other properties of the involution and coinvolution are obvious. If the semigroup S has no two-sided unit, then there is no corresponding homomorphism into $\mathbb{C}$, so that this is in fact a weakened involutive bialgebra.

To prove the converse, it is more convenient to consider the dual formulation and the dual algebra A'. Since A' is commutative and semisimple, it follows that it is isomorphic, as an algebra with involution, to $\mathbb{C}^n$. Since the comultiplication Δ is multiplicative, the image of an idempotent in A with respect to Δ is an idempotent in $A \bigotimes A$, hence the comultiplication determines a binary operation on the spectrum of the algebra $\mathbb{C}^n$, i.e., on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. By the coassociativity of Δ, this operation defines on the spectrum the structure of a finite associative semigroup, possibly without unit and possibly with zero. Since the involution commutes with the comultiplication, it determines an involution on the semigroup. This semigroup is inverse, as follows from the fact that every finite subsemigroup of complex matrices closed under the ordinary involution of matrices is inverse. In order to check this, one may use the following criterion of being inverse: A semigroup with involution is inverse if and only if the subsemigroup of idempotents is commutative (see [6, Theorem 1.17]); alternatively, one may use the analog of Cayley's theorem mentioned above (see also [21]). The existence of a counit in the bialgebra is equivalent to the existence of a unit in the semigroup. □

We have given a characterization of the class of semisimple cocommutative finite-dimensional involutive bialgebras. In contrast to group bialgebras, semigroup bialgebras of inverse semigroups in general are not Hopf algebras, since they have no antipode. But they have an "almost antipode": given the semigroup algebra of an inverse semigroup, consider the linear extension S of the operation $a \to a^{-1}$ of taking the inverse; this operator satisfies a condition that is different from the ordinary condition on an antipode. Namely, the left and right convolutions of S with the identity map, $S \star \mathrm{id}$ and $\mathrm{id} \star S$, are projections to the commutative subalgebra of idempotents rather than to the one-dimensional subspace of scalars, as must be the case for the antipode in a Hopf algebra. Thus the class of bialgebras we have described is closest to the class of Hopf algebras.[7]

[7]Note that the theory of representations of inverse semigroups by partially isometric operators is also very close to the theory of unitary representations of groups; besides, the semigroup bialgebra of a finite inverse semigroup with unit is *Plancherel* in the sense of [12, 31]; all this, in particular, allows one to simplify the proofs of many facts, for example, the theorem on semisimplicity and other properties of inverse semigroups mentioned above.

5 Positive 2-algebras

5.1 Definitions

Theorem 1 motivates the following basic definition:

Definition 3. *A semisimple 2-algebra A over $\mathbb{C}$ with multiplication $\delta : A \bigotimes A \to A$, unit ϵ, involution $\sharp$, comultiplication $\Delta : A \to A \bigotimes A$, counit ε, and coinvolution $\flat$ is called a* ***positive 2-algebra*** *if the operations are related as follows:*

(1) *The multiplication and the comultiplication are positive, i.e., the multiplication δ preserves the cone $K^\flat$, and the comultiplication Δ preserves the cone $K^\sharp$: $\delta(K^\flat \bigotimes K^\flat) \subset K^\flat$, $\Delta K^\sharp \subset K^\sharp \bigotimes K^\sharp$.*

(2) *As in the definition of involutive bialgebras, the involution $\sharp$ commutes with the comultiplication, and the coinvolution $\flat$ commutes with the multiplication: $\Delta(x^\sharp) = \{\Delta(x)\}^{\sharp\otimes\sharp}$, $x^\flat \cdot y^\flat = (x \cdot y)^\flat$.*

The notion of a positive 2-algebra extends the notion of an involutive bialgebra, replacing the condition that *the multiplication and the comultiplication should be multiplicative* by the weaker condition that *both operations should be positive.* In terms of duality of algebras, this notion was introduced in [29]. Theorem 1 implies the following corollary:

Corollary 1. *An involutive bialgebra satisfies conditions* (1), (2) *and hence is a positive 2-algebra.*

Indeed, condition (1) follows from the multiplicativity of the multiplication and comultiplication for bialgebras, and condition (2) is contained in the definition of involutive bialgebras.

Condition (1) for positive 2-algebras cannot be replaced by the condition that only one operation should be positive: here the positivity of one operation does not, in general, imply the positivity of the other one, as can be seen from simple examples (see, e.g., [5, 31]); this distinguishes positive 2-algebras from bialgebras. Recognizing whether or not a finite-dimensional 2-algebra is positive, given the finite-dimensional tensors of the multiplication and comultiplication, is an NP-complete problem (in contrast to checking whether a given 2-algebra is a bialgebra).

If we need to emphasize the existence of all the structures mentioned above in a bipositive algebra, we will write

$$A = A(\delta, \epsilon, \sharp, \Delta, \varepsilon, \flat).$$

The most important class of involutive bialgebras and positive 2-algebras is obtained by adding another two dual requirements relating both structures:

Definition 4. *A positive 2-algebra is called a homogeneous positive 2-algebra if, in addition to conditions* (1), (2)*, it satisfies the condition*

(3) *the counit is a positive homomorphism of the algebra into the field:* $\varepsilon(x\cdot y)=\varepsilon(x)\varepsilon(y)$*; and the coproduct of the unit is the unit in the tensor product:* $\delta(\epsilon)=\epsilon\bigotimes\epsilon$*. (These two conditions are symmetric with respect to the transition to dual algebras and are automatically satisfied for bialgebras.)*

The homogeneity condition (called so later in [31]) is exactly the condition of positive duality of pairs of algebras stated in the original paper [29]. It means that not only the cone of positive (copositive) elements is closed under the comultiplication (multiplication), but the compact sets of states (normalized positive elements) are also closed under these operations. This makes it possible to develop the so-called *geometric theory of duality of packets*, or *block simplices*, i.e., pairs of compact affine semigroups of states on algebras with involution, see [29, 12, 13]. *In what follows, unless otherwise stated, we consider only homogeneous positive 2-algebras.*[8] The recent paper [4] (see the references therein) contains a description of the group algebras of n-valued groups (n-Hopf algebras). This description is given in terms of Frobenius homomorphisms. Since the group algebras of involutive n-valued groups are a particular case of positive 2-algebras (namely, the case in which the structure constants are rational), it would be interesting to extend this description to all positive 2-algebras.

Somewhat freely, the difference between bialgebras and positive homogeneous 2-algebras can be expressed as follows: the multiplication (and comultiplication) in bialgebras is "deterministic," while in positive 2-algebras it is "probabilistic" or multivalued (see Sec. 3).

5.2 Algebras in positive duality ([29, 17])

The notion of a positive 2-algebra is a paraphrase of the notion of a pair of algebras in positive duality introduced in [29]. Let us give a very brief definition of this notion. Let A and B be two involutive unital algebras over $\mathbb{C}$, and assume that there is a nondegenerate complex pairing $<A,B>$ between these algebras. *The pair of algebras A and B is in a homogeneous positive duality* if the convex subset in B of states (= normalized positive definite functionals) of the algebra A is stable under the involution and multiplication in B, and, respectively, the convex subset in A of states of the algebra B is stable under the involution and multiplication in A; and, moreover, the unit of A (respectively, B) is the counit of B (respectively, A). A positive duality is called nonhomogeneous or weakened if

[8] Without going into details, we observe that, similarly to the fact proved in [31], the category of homogeneous finite-dimensional semisimple positive 2-algebras with the additional Plancherel condition (which is a condition of general position) is equivalent to the category of finite-dimensional algebras in Plancherel duality in the sense of [29, 13, 31] and the category of positive C-algebras [1].

only the cones of nonnegative elements are stable in the same sense, but there is no condition on the units. If we carry the multiplication in B (respectively, A) over to a comultiplication in A (respectively, B) in the standard way, then the obtained 2-algebra is a positive 2-algebra (respectively, the dual of a positive 2-algebra) in the sense of the definition given in Sec. 5.1.

Sometimes, the language of duality is more convenient than that of bialgebras. For example, it allows one to develop a meaningful study of the finite-dimensional and infinite-dimensional geometry of pairs of *packets*, which was considered in [29] as a geometric theory of states on $*$-algebras. A packet is a convex compactum of a certain kind (a block simplex) of states on a semisimple finite-dimensional $*$-algebra endowed with a multiplication. The geometry of packets is nontrivial even in the commutative case, where a packet is an affine simplex with the structure of a semigroup with involution. This geometry was much advanced in [12, 13]. The corresponding definitions cover, as particular cases, group algebras, algebras arising in algebraic combinatorics (cellular algebras), and some new examples. One may impose further restrictions on the relation between the multiplication and the comultiplication (the Plancherel property, etc.); on the author's initiative, they were considered in detail in [12, 13] and modified in recent papers on algebraic combinatorics, multivalued groups, etc., see [5, 31, 8, 4]; here we do not consider these problems.

6 Subobjects of involutive bialgebras and the statement of the main problem

6.1 Strict subobjects

Before formulating the central problem, we must define the notion of a subobject in the category of involutive bialgebras. The author does not know whether such a notion has been introduced for the category of bialgebras or Hopf algebras. There are various possible definitions of a subobject. We will consider two of them. Let A be an involutive bialgebra, and assume that B is a unital subalgebra of A (regarded as an algebra) closed under the involution and coinvolution. If the condition

$$\Delta B \subset B \bigotimes B \qquad (*)$$

is satisfied, then the comultiplication in B is inherited from A, so that it automatically is associative and commutes with the involution. In this case, B is an involutive bialgebra with the structures inherited from the bialgebra A, and it seems natural to regard B as a subobject in A. However, these conditions are almost never satisfied, so that the class of such subobjects is too narrow and does not cover the most interesting and nontrivial applications. Assume that instead of $(*)$, a much weaker condition is satisfied:

Definition 5. *Let A be a bialgebra and B be a unital subalgebra of A closed under the involution and coinvolution. It is called a strict subobject of the bialgebra A or an admissible subalgebra of the involutive bialgebra A if there exists a coideal J in A, also closed under the involution and coinvolution, such that A decomposes into the direct sum of B and J. The dual definition: a strict subobject of a bialgebra is a subcoalgebra for which there exists an ideal that decomposes the bialgebra into the direct sum of the subcoalgebra and the ideal.*

Under the natural identification of the quotient coalgebra A/J of the coalgebra A by the coideal J with the subalgebra B, the latter obtains the structure of a coalgebra and turns into a positive 2-algebra (see below); in general, it is not a bialgebra. This definition can be stated in other words. Let B be a unital subalgebra of a bialgebra A (regarded as an algebra) closed under the involution and coinvolution; assume that in A there is a positive projection $P = P_B$ from A onto the subalgebra B[9] such that the map

$$\Delta_{P_B} : B \to (P \otimes P)\Delta,$$

i.e., the P-projection of the comultiplication Δ to the subalgebra B, determines a coassociative comultiplication on B, and assume that the restriction of the counit of A to B is a counit with respect to this comultiplication.

Proposition 1. *For an admissible subalgebra B, the multiplication $\delta|_B$ and the comultiplication Δ_P introduced above are positive with respect to the coinvolution and the involution, respectively.*

Proof. We need to check only the positivity of the comultiplication, but a positive projection (= expectation) sends positive operations (such as a multiplicative comultiplication) to positive ones. □

This proposition, together with a direct check of condition (3), implies

Corollary 2. *An admissible subalgebra of an involutive bialgebra is a homogeneous positive 2-algebra.*

Remarks. 1) The condition of the admissibility of a subalgebra $B \subset A$ is very restrictive: although, as a rule, for every subalgebra there is a unique positive projection P_B, the coassociativity of $(P_B \bigotimes P_B)\Delta$ holds only in special cases (see the next section).

2) The apparent asymmetry between the multiplication and the comultiplication in our definition is dictated only by convenience considerations; it is easy to formulate an equivalent dual definition leading to the same class of subobjects.

[9] P_B is a positive expectation.

Let us formulate the latter definition in terms of pairs of algebras in positive duality, with the aim of giving a more extended definition of a subobject in the same terms.

Consider an involutive bialgebra $\widehat{A}$ over $\mathbb{C}$ as a pair of algebras in duality $< A, A' >$; here A is regarded as $\widehat{A}$ with the structure of an algebra, and A', the (algebraically) dual vector space, is endowed with the structure of an algebra with the multiplication dual to the comultiplication in $\widehat{A}$. Let $\widehat{B}$ be a positive 2-algebra, and let $< B, B' >$ be the pair of algebras in duality corresponding to it in the same sense. By the above observations, in both cases the duality of algebras is positive (in the second case, by definition). The following proposition is a tautological reformulation of the definition of a subobject given above.

Proposition 2. *Let T be an isomorphic positive unit-preserving embedding of the algebra B into the algebra A such that the restriction of the conjugate map $T' : A' \longrightarrow B'$ to some subalgebra C of A' is an isomorphism of C and B', and T' is an expectation to the subalgebra $C \subset A'$. Then*

1) *under the identification of C and B' defined by T', the multiplication in $B' = C$ corresponds to the comultiplication in B;*

2) *$T\widehat{B}$ is a subobject of $\widehat{A}$.*

Conversely, for every subobject $\widehat{B}$ of the bialgebra $\widehat{A}$, the operator T of embedding B as an algebra into A satisfies the above property.

6.2 Dynamical embeddings into involutive bialgebras: nonstrict subobjects

It turns out that the above definition of a subobject is too rigid for the solution of the dilation problem; as we will see, the positive solution is possible extremely rarely even in small dimensions, and the existence conditions for such a solution are apparently difficult to formulate. We will give a wider definition of a subobject, which could be called *dynamical*. More precisely, we will define a new notion of an embedding of a positive 2-algebra into an involutive bialgebra. See [11] for the definitions of a comodule and a coaction; these definitions are easy to interpret in terms of pairs of algebras in duality.

Definition 6. *We say that a positive 2-algebra $\widehat{B}$ can be nonstrictly embedded into a bialgebra $\widehat{A}$, or that its image is a nonstrict subobject of $\widehat{A}$, if there exists a positive isomorphic embedding of algebras $T : \widehat{B} \to \widehat{A}$, preserving the unit, involution, and coinvolution, such that the (left) coaction of $\widehat{B}$ as a coalgebra on itself can be extended from the algebra TB to a (left) coaction of the whole coalgebra $\widehat{A}$ on itself.*

In the definition of a strict subobject, the comultiplication in the subalgebra was being lifted (using a projection to the subalgebra) to a comultiplication in the whole bialgebra; in

the new definition, only the coaction must be lifted, and there are no conditions on the way in which this lifting should be realized. One may say that we embed not a positive 2-algebra but rather this 2-algebra regarded as an algebra with a coherent structure of a comodule. The difference between the two notions of embedding can be seen even for bicommutative algebras, where the multiplication and the comultiplication are commutative. The dual statement can be obtained by considering the dual coalgebras.

6.3 Statement of the main problem

Now we are ready to give an exact statement of the dilation problem, or the problem of embedding positive 2-algebras into bialgebras.

6.3.1 Strict version

Let

$$A = A(\delta, \epsilon, \sharp, \Delta, \varepsilon, \flat)$$

be a finite-dimensional homogeneous positive 2-algebra. When is there a (perhaps, weakened) involutive bialgebra $\mathcal{A}$ such that A is isomorphic to some strict subobject $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$? If the answer is positive, then we will say that the corresponding involutive bialgebra $\mathcal{A}$ is a strict ***dilation*** *of the positive 2-algebra A. When is there a minimal canonical strict dilation?*

Let us call this problem, as well as the next one, the *problem of lifting a positive 2-algebra into a bialgebra* or the *problem of strict dilation of a positive 2-algebra* (in probabilistic terms, the *problem of derandomizing a probabilistic comultiplication*). The homogeneity allows us to interpret the dilation problem as the problem of "derandomizing" a probabilistic comultiplication (see Sec. 3).

If we seek a solution of the problem in the class of finite-dimensional involutive bialgebras, then we certainly need to introduce additional restrictions on the positive 2-algebra: it must have generators with rational structure constants; the irrationality of the structure constants in any generators requires passing to infinite-dimensional algebras.

Taking into account Theorem 2, the main problem stated above can be formulated in much more concrete terms: *What finite-dimensional semisimple cocommutative homogeneous positive 2-algebras with rational structure constants are isomorphic to an admissible subalgebra of the dual semigroup algebra of an inverse semigroup (in particular, a group)? In other words, when there exists a strict dilation into the semigroup algebra of an inverse semigroup of an arbitrary rational commutative positive 2-algebra?* By analogy with groups, one could say that the corresponding positive 2-algebras are of semigroup origin. The examples below show that this extension of the class of algebras is not sufficient for the positive solution

of the problem, and for the two-dimensional algebras, it gives nothing new compared with group bialgebras (see Sec. 6).

It presents no difficulty to state the problem in terms of the structure constant tensor of the comultiplication in the basis of minimal idempotents with respect to the multiplication, and then formulate the problem itself as a problem of decomposing the comultiplication tensors of a positive 2-algebra with respect to the Cayley tensors of a group operation. This formulation only emphasizes the difficulty of the problem, but hardly provides a method of its solution.

6.3.2 Nonstrict version

Let us modify the statements of the previous section by replacing the words "strict subobject," "strict dilation," etc. by "nonstrict subobject," "nonstrict dilation," etc. Then we will obtain the nonstrict version of the problem. The only difference between the two versions is that the latter uses a wider notion of a subobject. This is a less rigid statement of the problem; such a dilation will also be called *dynamical*. This notion is closer to the notion of dilation in the sense of operator theory [25]. However, the supply of positive 2-algebras for which a nonstrict dilation is possible is much wider than in the first case; this can be seen already in the case of bicommutative positive 2-algebras (see the next section). The nonstrict version, in its geometric formulation, is also illustrated by the example of Sec. 6.4.2.

6.4 Examples of strict and nonstrict subobjects

6.4.1 Positive 2-algebras that are strict subobjects of involutive bialgebras

The complex group algebra $\mathbb{C}[G]$ of a finite group G, regarded as the algebra of formal sums of group elements (or as the algebra of complex measures on G with the comultiplication that carries such a measure from the group G over to the diagonal of the direct product $G \times G$ and the ordinary involution and coinvolution), is an involutive bialgebra (and even a Hopf algebra with the antipode $g \to g^{-1}$). The coproduct of a group element g is the sum of group elements whose product is equal to g.

The dual involutive bialgebra to the group algebra of a finite group is a commutative involutive bialgebra: this is the space of all complex functions on the group with pointwise multiplication, diagonal comultiplication $\Delta : \mathbb{C}[G] \to \mathbb{C}[G] \bigotimes \mathbb{C}[G]$, $(\Delta f)(g,h) = f(gh)$, involution $(\sharp f)(g) = \bar{f}(g)$, and coinvolution $(\flat f)(g) = \bar{f}(g^{-1})$. The unit is the function identically equal to one, and the counit is the functional "the value of a function at the identity element of the group."

A general example of an admissible subalgebra (strict subobject) of a group bialgebra is as follows.

Proposition 3. *The subalgebra $\mathbb{C}[H\backslash G/H] \equiv \mathcal{B}_H$ of double cosets of a subgroup H (sometimes called the Hecke algebra corresponding to the subgroup H) in the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is a positive 2-algebra that is an admissible subalgebra of the bialgebra $\mathbb{C}[G]$ in the sense defined above.*

Proof. The projection P from $\mathbb{C}[G]$ to $\mathcal{B}_H$ consists in averaging over the double cosets of H; obviously, this projection is a positive expectation (i.e. $P(xay) = xP(a)y$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{B}_H$, $a \in \mathbb{C}[G]$) that projects the comultiplication in $\mathbb{C}[G]$ to the natural comultiplication on the space of double cosets (dual to the multiplication of cosets). It is obvious that the subalgebra $\mathcal{B}_H$ is closed under the involution and coinvolution and contains the unit and counit, as well as that the required relations between the operations are satisfied. □

The previous proposition remains literally true if we replace the partition into the double cosets of a subgroup by an arbitrary *stable partition* of the group, i.e., a partition such that the space of functions constant on the partition blocks is an invariant unital subalgebra of the group algebra; then, just as above, this space is a positive 2-algebra with respect to the induced structures. An example of a stable partition distinct from the partition into the double cosets of a subgroup is the partition into the orbits of some group of automorphisms of the group.

This example can be extended to inverse semigroups. By Theorem 2, the semigroup bialgebras of these semigroups are involutive and semisimple, and one may consider subobjects of these bialgebras in the above sense. It is easy to check that the 2-algebra associated with a stable partition of an inverse semigroup, understood in the same sense as in the case of groups, is an admissible subalgebra (subobject) of the semigroup bialgebra, and the structure constants of such a 2-algebra are rational. Conversely, the proof of Theorem 2 in fact contains the assertion that an admissible subalgebra of the dual semigroup algebra is associated with a stable partition of the inverse semigroup. Thus we obtain

Corollary 3. *The class of strict subobjects of involutive finite-dimensional semisimple bialgebras coincides with the class of positive 2-algebras generated by stable partitions of finite inverse semigroups (in particular, groups).*

Indeed, by Theorem 2, given such a bialgebra, we can first construct an inverse semigroup and then a stable partition of this semigroup. In the bicommutative case, the supplies of strict subobjects for group and semigroup bialgebras coincide. Thus in this case the main problem (the dilation problem or the problem of derandomizing a comultiplication) reduces to describing examples of group origin (Schur algebras). It is these examples that were intensively studied, but with another interpretation and another terminology (see [31]), in papers on the theory of association schemes. However, this is only a small part of positive 2-algebras (or, in another language, cellular algebras, C-algebras, etc.). We emphasize that the

theory of association schemes studies not merely algebras of certain types, but their integer-valued representations. The considerations of this work are algebraic; problems concerning representations of algebras, especially integer-valued ones, should be considered separately. Note that the strict dilation problem can be stated in tensor terms (in terms of the structure constants of multiplication and comultiplication), similarly to the reformulation given below of the nonstrict dilation problem for bicommutative 2-algebras in terms of matrices of quasi-characters; this question will be considered separately.

6.4.2 Classification of two-dimensional algebras; the difference between strict and nonstrict dilations

The class of nonstrict subobjects is much wider than that of strict ones; both have never been studied. For want of space, we restrict ourselves to an example, leaving details till another opportunity. Namely, we will illustrate the difference between the two dilation problems with the example of two-dimensional 2-algebras. Every two-dimensional positive 2-algebra is obviously bicommutative. Up to an isomorphism, it can be described as follows. As a vector space, it is the two-dimensional complex space $\mathbb{C}^2$. A structure of an algebra is defined by generators, the unit $\mathbf{1}$ of the algebra and an element $\mathbf{u}$, and the relation

$$\mathbf{u}^2 = (1-\lambda)\cdot\mathbf{u} + \lambda\cdot\mathbf{1}, \qquad \lambda \in [0,1].$$

The structure of a coalgebra is defined by the formulas

$$\Delta(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}\otimes\mathbf{1}, \qquad \Delta(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}\otimes\mathbf{u}.$$

The involution and the coinvolution are the complex conjugation, the counit ϵ is given by the formulas $\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}) = -\lambda$, $\varepsilon(\mathbf{1}) = 1$.[10] Denote the obtained 2-algebra by A_λ. It is easy to check that A_λ is a positive 2-algebra, since all the axioms of Sec. 4 are satisfied. Note that the multiplication determines the algebra of truncated polynomials of second degree in the variable u. In the standard basis of the space $\mathbb{C}^2$, which is regarded as a coalgebra, the unit takes the form $\mathbf{1} = (1,1)$ and the generator $\mathbf{u}$ has the coordinates $(-\lambda, 1)$. It is easy to prove the following

Proposition 4. *Every two-dimensional positive semisimple 2-algebra is isomorphic to one of the 2-algebras A_λ, $\lambda \in [0,1]$. For $\lambda = 1$, this is the group algebra of a group of second order; for $\lambda = 0$, the semigroup algebra of the semigroup $\{< 1, p > | p^2 = p\}$. For $\lambda \in (0,1]$, the algebra A_λ is Plancherel.*

[10] In the dual description, the generating idempotents are ε and v, and the comultiplication and the unit are given by the formulas $\Delta\varepsilon = \varepsilon\otimes\varepsilon$, $\Delta(v) = v\otimes 1 + 1\otimes v + (1-\lambda)v\otimes v$, $\mathbf{1}(\varepsilon) = 1$, $\mathbf{1}(v) = 0$.

Theorem 3. 1. *The positive 2-algebra A_λ admits a strict dilation into an involutive bialgebra (i.e., can be embedded as a strict subobject into an involutive bialgebra, namely, into the group algebra of a finite commutative group) if and only if λ is a positive root of the equation*

$$z^2 - (2+\alpha)z + 1 = 0,$$

where α is of the form $\alpha = k \cdot \frac{(s-1)^2}{s}$ with k, s arbitrary positive integers. Rational values of λ correspond to $k = 1$ and are of the form $\lambda = n^{-1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$; for other k, the values of λ are irrational.

2. *Assume that λ is an arbitrary rational number; then A_λ admits a nonstrict dilation into the group algebra of a finite commutative group.*

For example, the algebra $A_{1/3}$ admits a nonstrict, but not a strict, dilation into a bialgebra.

In the general case (see [29, 12]), an n-dimensional homogeneous bicommutative positive 2-algebra is determined by a matrix of *quasi-characters*, i.e, a complex matrix satisfying the following property: the coordinatewise product of any two rows (columns) is a convex combination of rows (columns), and all the coordinates of the first row and the first column are equal to one. For the group bialgebra of a commutative group, this is the matrix of characters; for the algebra A_λ, this matrix has the form $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -\lambda \end{pmatrix}$, $\lambda \in [0,1]$.

The problem concerning nonstrict dilations of bicommutative positive 2-algebras into bicommutative bialgebras reduces to the question whether one can represent the matrix of quasi-characters as a coarse grain of the matrix of characters of some commutative group (or inverse semigroup).

Translated by N. V. Tsilevich.

References

[1] E. Bannai and T. Ito. *Algebraic Combinatorics. I. Association Schemes.* The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., Menlo Park, CA, 1984.

[2] S. Bochner. On a theorem of Tannaka and Krein. *Ann. Math.*, **43** (1942), 56–58.

[3] N. Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Espaces vectoriels topologiques.* Masson, Paris, 1981.

[4] V. M. Buchstaber. n-Valued groups: theory and applications. *Moscow Math. J.*, **6** (2006), No. 1, 57–84.

[5] V. M. Bukhshtaber, A. M. Vershik, S. A. Evdokimov, and I. N. Ponomarenko. Combinatorial algebras and multivalued involutive groups. *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, **30** (1996), No. 3, 158–162 (1997).

[6] A. H. Clifford and G. B. Preston. *The Algebraic Theory of Semigroups*, Vol. I. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1961.

[7] P. Deligne. Catégories tannakiennes. *Progr. Math.*, **87**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, 1990, pp. 111–195.

[8] S. A. Evdokimov. Schurity and separability of associative schemes. "Doctor of Sciences" Thesis, St. Petersburg State University, 2005.

[9] A. Joyal and R. Street. An introduction to Tannaka duality and quantum groups. *Lecture Notes in Math.*, **1448**, Springer, Berlin, 1991, pp. 413–492.

[10] D. G. Higman. Invariant relations, coherent configurations, generalized polygons. In: *Combinatorics* (Proc. Advanced Study Inst., Breukelen, 1974), Part 3: *Combinatorial Group Theory*. Math. Centre Tracts, No. 57, Math. Centrum, Amsterdam, 1974, pp. 27–43.

[11] C. Kassel. *Quantum Groups*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[12] S. V. Kerov. Duality of finite-dimensional $*$-algebras. *Vestnik LGU, Ser. Mat.*, **7** (1974) 23–29.

[13] S. V. Kerov. Duality of C^*-algebras and its examples in the representation theory of groups. Ph.D. Thesis, Leningrad State University, 1974.

[14] A. N. Kolmogorov. *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 2003.

[15] M. G. Krein. On positive functionals on almost periodic functions. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **30** (1941), No. 1, 9–12.

[16] M. G. Krein. Principle of duality for bicompact groups and quadratic block algebras. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **69** (1949), No. 6, 725–728.

[17] M. G. Krein. Hermitian-positive kernels on homogeneous spaces. I. *Ukrain. Mat. Zhurnal*, **1** (1949), No. 4, 64–98.

[18] M. G. Krein. Hermitian-positive kernels on homogeneous spaces. II. *Ukrain. Mat. Zhurnal*, **2** (1950), No. 1, 10–59.

[19] A. Massoud. Tannaka–Krein duality for compact groups, `arXiv:math.OA/0308259`.

[20] V. A. Oganesyan. On the semisimplicity of a system algebra. *Doklady Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR*, **21** (1955), 145–147.

[21] G. I. Olshanski. Unitary representations of the infinite symmetric group: semigroup approach. In: *Lie Groups and Lie Algebras*. Akad. Kiado, Budapest, 1985, pp. 181–198.

[22] N. Saavedra Rivano. *Catégories Tannakiens.* Lecture Notes in Math., **265**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin–New York, 1972.

[23] L. Scott. A condition on Higman parameters. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 701-20-45 (1972).

[24] L. Scott. Modular permutation representations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **175** (1973), 101–121.

[25] B. Szökefalvi-Nagy and C. Foias. *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space.* North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam–London; American Elsevier Publishing Co., Inc., New York; Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1970.

[26] T. Tannaka. Über den Dualitätssatz der nichtkommutativen topologishen Gruppen, *Tohoku Math. J.*, **45** (1938), 1–12.

[27] L. I. Vainerman. The papers of M. G. Krein in representation theory and harmonic analysis on topological groups. *Ukrainian Math. J.*, **46** (1994), No. 3, 204–218 (1995).

[28] A. Van Daele. Quantum groups with invariant integrals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **97** (2000), No. 2, 541–546.

[29] A. M. Vershik. Geometrical theory of states, the von Neumann boundary, and duality of $*$-algebras. *Zapiski Nauchn. Semin. POMI*, **29** (1972), 147–154. English translation: *J. Sov. Math.*, **3** (1975), 840–845.

[30] A. Vershik. Polymorphisms, Markov processes, and quasi-similarity. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **13** (2005), No. 5, 1305–1324.

[31] A. M. Vershik, S. A. Evdokimov, and I. N. Ponomarenko. Algebras in Plancherel duality, and algebraic combinatorics. *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, **31** (1997), No. 4, 252–261 (1998).

[32] A. M. Vershik. Krein duality, positive 2-algebras, and dilation of comultiplications. PDMI preprint 1/2007 (2007).